DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 769 JC 810 017

AUTHOR Hammons, Jim
TITLE Staff Development in the Community College Past, Present, and Future.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education (3rd, Orlando, FL, February 28-March 2, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; Administrators; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Conferences; *Educational History; Literature Reviews; Organizational Development; Outcomes of Education; Professional Associations; *Staff Development; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This three-part paper traces the history of staff development in community colleges, assesses its current status, and establishes provisions for its effective continuation. The history of staff development is traced through a review of publications on the topic, a discussion of the national conferences on staff development, and a narrative concerning the author's experiences with staff development. Next, reasons why colleges are becoming interested in staff development are enumerated, first in terms of general staff benefits, and then in terms of the benefits specific to faculty and administrators. This section concludes with a discussion of four additional antecedents to the staff development movement. The examination of the present state of staff development focuses on the growing numbers of people becoming active in the movement, organizational patterns that have emerged, institutional provisions for staff development, persistent problems that hinder effectiveness, and elements essential for program success. The recommendations presented in the final section include the following: the increased use of packaged programs, the inclusion of staff development in performance appraisals, the institutional acceptance of program costs, the use of outside consultants, adequate program evaluations, and the pursuit of organizational as well as staff development objectives. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197769

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE.

JIM HAMMONS

Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education (3rd, February 28 - March 2, 1979, Orlando, FL)

1979

JC 810 017

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James O. Hammons

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Staff Development in the Community College

Past, Present, and Future

by

Jim Hammons

When Al called to ask me to speak at this year's conference, he mentioned that the theme of the conference would be "Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education: Lessons Learned and Unfinished Agendas". The latter part of that theme, "Lessons Learned and Unfinished Agenda's" intrigued me. During the twelve years I have been involved in the community college staff development movement I have learned a number of lessons, and, based on my experiences, I have some strong feelings regarding the directions I think staff development should follow. The opportunity to share these thoughts with you and the hope that what I might say would help to keep the staff development move alive convinced me to come. The realization that February weather in Orlando is a lot better than that in the mountains of Arkansas had absolutely no bearing on my decision -- as I'm sure it didn't those of you from the Northeast and Midwest.

Before beginning my presentation, I'd like to find out a little about you.

First, how many of you are full time staff development people?

JC 810 017

Featured presentation at the Third Annual Conference on Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education. February 28 - March 2, 1979, Orlando, Florida.

Next, how many of you have responsibilities for staff development on a part-time basis?

Next, of those remaining, how many of you are members of a staff development committee?

Next, how many of you are administrators who are not actually involved in, but are interested in staff development?

Finally, how many of you are faculty members who are not actually involved in, but are interested in staff development?

It's encouraging and gratifying to see the number of people attending who have full and part-time responsibilities in staff development. You are visible evidence of the distance the staff development move has come. But it was not always that way. Let me review with you the history of staff development. In doing so, I'm going to look at SD from three perspectives:

publications on the topic
national conferences about staff development
evolution of the concept

First, publications. While with the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State, I met Terry Wallace, a faculty member at Harrisburg Community College. Terry took a course with me and became very interested in staff development. I encouraged him to do a literature search on the topic which the Center subsequently published. Terry's bibliography, to our knowledge the first attempt to assemble the writings on the topic, covered the period 1955-1975. It turned up sixty-six citations, all written during the period 1967-1975, and most during the 1970-1975 period. Since then, there have been numberous bibliographies compiled with each showing a geometric increase in the attention to the topic. One of the most recent

publications, our Staff Development Handbook which the ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges published, was out-of-print in three months -- despite their having printed more copies than any of their other monographs.

The growing popularity and interest in the topic is also reflected in the number of national conferences devoted to the topic. Let me trace the history of the present staff development in terms of national conferences. I am uniquely prepared to do this, for to my knowledge I am the only person who has been present at each. The first national conference on staff development was conducted by Dick Wilson of the AACJC in the summer of 1970. The second national conference, also sponsored by AACJC was held at the Early House in Virginia. The occasion was the 1973 Assembly of the AACJC. The topic was "Educational Opportunity for All: New Staff for New Students". The Center for the Study of Higher Education where I had now moved sponsored the next national conference, this one held at Penn State during the summer of 1974. This was followed by one at Columbia, Missouri. In large part, the first four were much the same -- each defined staff development -- which is still a problem by the way; each stressed the need for staff development; and each explored some of the issues involved. The ones at Penn State and Missouri went a little further in that both actually involved participants in planning a staff development program for a hypothetical college. The fifth, held in St. Louis was considerably different. By that time enough colleges had staff development programs that a substantial portion of time and one entire volume (the proceedings

required two volumes and 75 pages) could be devoted to descriptions of institutional programs. Very little time was devoted to why staff development was needed and, for the most part, we focused on problems encountered in starting, maintaining and evaluating programs. A FIPSIE grant to Burlington County College funded the next national conference on staff development in Atlanta on May 8, 1977. On the surface, that conference appeared much like the St. Louis one but there were some significant differences. These were important for they reflect the emerging state of the art.

1. For the first time, current issues were highlighted -- such as critical elements in the success and failure of programs, funding and the effects of collective bargaining.
2. The concept of staff was broadened to include managers, non-instructional staff, and adjunct faculty as well as full-time faculty.
3. Third, and perhaps most significant of all, for the first time, a new concept was introduced -- organizational development. This was the first time that we had acknowledged that it wasn't enough to change the staff -- the organization itself had to change.

At the conference the foundation for a national organization was laid and less than a year later, in Zion, Illinois, the National Council of Staff, Program and Organizational Development was established. In less than one year this new organization had over 300 members. When they held their first annual meeting in Dallas last summer more than 200 persons attended.

The increase in publications and conferences both spurred and evidenced an interest in establishing staff development programs on campuses all over the country. Although the majority of those programs established were, in reality, faculty development programs, a few, such as the one developed by Carol Zion at Miami-Dade, were truly staff development oriented. However, the change from the faculty orientation programs of the 1950's and 60's to the concept of a comprehensive staff development program did not occur overnight.

In many ways, my own experiences are representative of the evolution of the idea. My involvement in staff development began in Miami in 1966 when, as the newly employed Assistant-to-the South Campus Director, I was given the task of planning a faculty orientation program for 40 new faculty. Characteristic of that era, after we had "oriented" them, we considered our job done. The idea of providing more than a two day orientation simply did not occur to me or anyone else. We assumed faculty were competent in their subject fields and since our student body was a traditional study body (remember this was 1966 and South Campus served essentially an upper middle class clientele) the traditional methods which these new faculty used were perfectly appropriate. The next step of my evolution occurred in 1968, when I accepted the position as dean of a yet-to-be opened new community college in New Jersey. By that time, I, like many other administrators, was concerned that an open-door philosophy was in reality becoming a revolving door due largely to the inability of a traditionally prepared faculty to adapt their instruction to an emerging traditional student body.

Somewhere in the three years between 1966 and 1969 I had also learned not to depend on universities to do more than train faculty in content areas. So, in the summer of 1969, I moved from an orientation program of two-days to a pre-service program of seven weeks in order to prepare the charter faculty of a new college for teaching in a community college. In the one-half of each day devoted to this were sessions on the history and philosophy of the community college, characteristics of community college students, the writing of instructional objectives, and test-item construction. Although admittedly a poor first effort, it was still better than nothing and our new faculty ate it up!

My evolution took another great step at the end of the first year. Realizing the need for day-to-day assistance to our faculty and acknowledging that neither the division heads or myself had the time or the training to provide this assistance, I wrote a description for what I called an Educational Development Officer, who was to be responsible for pre-service and in-service training of faculty. With his help, I was able, during the 1970-71 school year, to initiate an in-service program for existing faculty. This was followed in the fall of 1971 by a specially designed program for adjunct faculty and, soon afterwards, a beginning effort toward a management training program for our administrative staff and some sessions for our non-instructional staff. Shortly after that, in 1972, I left the college to join the staff of the Community College Division of The National Laboratory for Higher Education which was attempting to develop materials and conduct training for both faculty and educational development officers.

At this point it might be useful to summarize some of the reasons why colleges all over the country are now beginning to be interested in staff development or to explain why it was not until the early 1970's that we realized the importance of staff development. I will discuss the reasons in terms of why all staff in a community college can benefit from staff development activities then focus on reasons specific to faculty and managers.

All Staff

- Due to a lack of preprofessional and preservice programs, or the inadequacies of existing programs, most staff members were not initially prepared to work in the community college.
- Few community colleges have developed valid inservice or pre-service programs. Thus little has been done to correct the initial lack of staff preparation.
- The need for increased effectiveness and efficiency due to competition for limited tax dollars and growing public demands for accountability.
- A decline in the birth rate and the trend towards decreasing enrollments has led to a "steady-state" environment characterized by low staff turnover and the subsequent recognition that needed changes would come about through the efforts of present staff rather than through employment of new persons.
- Acknowledgment that the future success of the community college depends upon the ability of its staff to adapt to a constantly changing environment.

Faculty

- The development of a technology of instruction, including both hardware and software, has accelerated tremendously. In the last decade alone there had been an emergence of "systems," P.S.I., audio-tutorial, cognitive mapping, human potential training, tape cassettes, video cassetes, and now video discs. Most faculty are unaware of these developments and their potential for improved instruction.
- Faculty are aware of their inability to cope with needs of the increasing percentages of "high risk" students now enrolling in community colleges.
- A redefinition of the student clientele of the community college as being other than the 18-21 year old, and a trend toward taking the college to the student--into stores, into prisons, into factories -- is redefining the fole of faculty.

Managers

- Few community college managers are even vaguely familiar with the "science" of management that is slowly evolving.
- Having recognized that change is imperative, managers realize the need to become skilled in planning, implementing and evaluating change.
- The increasing impact of court decisions, collective bargaining and state and federal regulations on institutional governance requires managers who understood their implications and can develop strategies to cope with them.

- Turnover in management positions at the mid-management levels is relatively high. Since most replacements are hired from within the institution from faculty positions there is a continuing need to train them in essential management skills.

In addition there are a number of other factors which are antecedents to the staff development move. In a presentation like this I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge a few of the more significant factors such as:

1. The Educational Professional Development Act (or EPDA) which made available small grants (in the $15,000 - $60,000 range) for faculty development activities. True to form, program followed the money and soon hundreds of colleges were writing proposals for faculty development. This was followed by Title III, a story I'm sure you are familiar with.
2. The efforts of John Roueche and his colleagues at the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia. In slightly over four years, thousands of faculty were exposed to the writing of instructional objectives, criterion referenced evluation, mastery learning and individualized instruction.
3. An improved communication system within the junior college world. By 1976 there were six different journals devoted to the community college which have facilitated much more rapid transmission of ideas.

4. The availability of "flowers" (colleges) of innovation and "bees" (consultants) to distribute the pollen of ideas from one college to another.

THE PRESENT

At this time I would like to turn to an examination of the present state of staff development in the community college. In discussing the present status of staff development I want to focus on the following:

numbers
organizational patterns
institutional provisions for staff development
some persistent problems which hinder effectiveness
essential elements for success

Numbers

The current popularity of staff development is exemplified by the 700 persons who currently hold membership in NCSPOD, the more than 100 institutions which I have identified as having an organized staff development program, the eight state organizations which now exist and the recent attendance at four regional NCSPOD workshops.

Organizational patterns

While no single pattern of organization for staff development has thus emerged, several models do appear quite frequently. The first of these, the line manager approach, is, in most instances little better than nothing. Administrators tend to busy themselves with those things with deadlines attached to them while staff development is neglected.

A pattern which I've encountered numerous times is the committee approach. With a few notable exceptions such as at Harrisburg Area Community College, this approach does not appear to yield significant results due primarily to the luck of fixed responsibility.

A number of colleges chose to select an administrator and give him/her the job on a part-time basis. When he/she is smart enough to get themselves an advisory committee, this model can work quite well as evidenced by its success at Yauapaii Community College in Prescott, Arizona.

A few colleges (mostly with FTE in excess of 5,000) have appointed a full-time staff person for staff development. Westark Community College in Arkansas and Lansing Community College in Michigan are showing that this is a workable model -- especially when an advisory committee is appointed to assist the coordinator.

The final model which I've seen working is what I call the industrial model, so named because it most resembles the pattern of some industrial concerns. This model is typlified by Florida Junior College in Jacksonville which has a professional staff of five people and several support staff.

Institutional provisions for Staff Development

There are a variety of ways in which colleges are providing for staff development. A listing of those that I have encountered follows:

- Travel funds to attend professional meetings, workshops or visit other colleges

- Funded fellowships for staff to pursue extensive curriculum, administrative, or instructional development activities
- Released time during the school year for faculty
- Short term leaves (with and without pay)
- Sabbaticals (including administrators)
- Tuition payment for graduate work
- Awarding credit toward promotion based on participation in staff development activities
- Providing a copyright policy that encourages development of innovative approaches to problems both in and out of the classroom
- Sponsoring on-campus seminars and workshops for staff
- On-campus university courses for staff
- Exchange programs
- Provision of a professional development collection within the college's library
- Providing support personnel, equipment, and supplies needed to facilitate staff efforts (media production, computer assistance, and so on)
- Employment of a full-time person to facilitate the staff development effort
- Carefully planned preservice programs for new staff
- An appraisal program based on developmental rather than judgmental concerns

Persistent Problems

A number of nagging problems continued to prevent most staff development programs from realizing their potential. These are:

- Inadequate attention to management
- Non-instructional and trustee development

The vast majority of present staff development programs continue to be faculty oriented. By contrast, virtually no attention has been given to other staff. This is particularly true of department/division chairpersons and non-instructional staff. Deans and presidents each have ample travel funds and national organizations which provide numerous opportunities for professional development. Even trustees now have a national organization. However, with the exception of the workshop conducted by Community College Associates, nothing exists for the chairperson and nothing of an organized basis for non-instructional staff members.

- Lack of clearly defined goals. In all too many cases, colleges have rushed pell-mell into implementing a staff development program without thinking through the goals they seek to achieve. Without clearly defined goals to provide direction the program soon becomes nothing more than a disjointed series of activities.
- Inadequate administrative commitment - A consistent failure of many programs is a lack of sufficient administrative support to show the wary skeptic that this is not just another "bandwagon" which too, shall pass.

- Scheduling - To my knowledge, with the possible exception of a few colleges with staff development days on their calendar, no one has yet solved the problem of when and how to best fit staff development activities into an already full schedule.
- Inadequate evaluation of the results - John Centra (1976) found that only 19 percent of the faculty development programs in his survey had completed evaluations of their programs. My own on-site visitations would indicate that that is an optimistic figure. I'll say more on this later.

Essential Elements for Success

A logical way of concluding the section dealing with the present status of staff development would seem to be to summarize what appear to be the elements essential to a successful staff development program. Based on my experiences these are:

Acceptance of the need for staff development by the staff -- Staff development is adult development and for adults to participate, they must perceive a need.

A program based on the needs of the staff -- Staff can agree on the need for staff development and disagree with the content of the program. To insure that does not happen, staff needs must be considered when programs are designed.

Measurable program objectives that relate to institutional goals -- A staff development effort should affect both staff needs and goals and institutional goals and problems. For this to occur, institutional goals and staff development program objectives must be determined and then linked with individual priorities.

An organizational climate conducive to staff development activities -- If a college is in the throes of negotiating a first collective bargaining agree; if there has been a significant turnover in key administrative positions; if there is some current large scale controversy (e.g., dismissal of a popular faculty member); or if a recent reduction in the number of personnel has occurred, institutions would be well advised to postpone starting a staff development program.

A publicly stated commitment by the board, the president, and the administration regarding the importance of developing and maintaining a staff development program -- As shown earlier, the roles of administrators in staff development activities are critical ones. For any staff development program to succeed, it must have the support of the administration, and, through them, the board.

The assignment of responsibility for the program -- Who is responsible does not appear to be as important as the assurance that some one or group has been identified. Without a clear assignment of responsibility, a program may flounder, then die.

Involvement of the participants in planning, implementing and evaluating programs -- Again, staff are adults, and adults want to be involved in all aspects of any program that affects them, especially one that so directly related to their professional and personal lives.

Voluntary participation by a sufficient number of staff to give the program credibility -- Expecting all staff to become involved in anything (with the possible exception of allocation of office space or parking places) is doomed to frustration. Not all staff will be interested in staff development. However, there must be enough persons to give the program credibility in the eyes of the staff.

Adequate financial support to meet the expressed identified needs of the staff -- Too much money is just as dangerous as too little. However, there must be enough resources to warrant the time and effort it will take to involve those staff who wish to participate and to have an impact on the staff and the institution. As a corollary to this, I add as a desirable element that staff development should be a part of the normal budget of a college, not something added when outside funds are available or when there is extra money.

Sufficient flexibility to meet differing staff needs -- Just as staff development needs between groups of staff (faculty-counselors) are different, so are the needs among groups. A program must be sufficiently eclectic to allow for group as well as individual differences.

An effective promotion plan -- Regardless of the issue, there will always be a sizeable portion of any group who "never get the word". Carefully planned promotion of scheduled staff developed events will help ensure that a program fails or succeeds on its own merits rather than on its attendance figures.

A reward system for participation acceptable to participants -- Community college staff members are busy people who are torn between competing and conflicting demands on their time. Like anyone else, they have needs and goals that must be met. In deciding among alternatives regarding the use of their time, they need an answer to the question "What is in it for me?" Participation in staff development and subsequent changes in behavior require time that might be spent on activities such as hobbies, writing a textbook, or other instructional materials. Consequently, reward systems (the plural form is deliberate due to the differences in individuals) for participation in staff development must be considered.

Staff development and staff evaluation are separated -- Unless participation in staff development is an accepted contractual responsibility (the word accepted is key), it is a fatal mistake to mix the two. Given the nature of adult learners and

the present status of community college performance appraisal systems, any attempt to relate them will result in attendance, not involvement, and the application of objective, quantitative measures (How many staff development sessions did you attend last year?) to a very subjective and internal activity.

Staff development is a year round activity -- I add this to call attention to the futility of staff development programs that are comprised solely of fall orientation, a guest speaker at mid-semester, and spring orientation. Staff development is a continuing, ongoing process, not an event.

A valid evaluation plan -- Without a valid appraisal of staff reaction, learning, behavioral changes or results of staff development efforts, a staff development program is extremely vulnerable to the attacks of one or two local critics, the well-intentioned cuts of a budget-balancing business manager, the building fund priorities of a facility oriented president, the cost cutting impulses of community pressured board members, or the remote impartiality of state officials.

The program is not dependent on one person -- While responsibility for staff development must be fixed, that does not imply that the success of the program is dependent on one individual. A strong, representative advisory committee will insure continuation of the program when the leader steps down or moves on.

THE FUTURE

The title of this paper was "Staff Development in the Community College: Past, Present and Future". Thus far, we've reviewed the past and examined the present. Now, let's look to the future.

But first, does staff development have a future? Can it survive the resistance of staff, the ineptness of management, the poor quality of existing programs, the budget squeezes which lie ahead, the pressures of collective-bargaining? I think so -- provided several things occur. Let me enumerate these. The heading for this section might be thought of as: Staff Development Has a Future Provided That:

We make increased use of packaged programs - Recently, Gordon Watts, Wanda Thomas and I have been putting the finishing touches on a master list of staff development needs for faculty and managers in community colleges. As I was looking over these lists I couldn't help but notice how finite the lists are and how inefficient it is for each college to attempt to develop programs for meeting the same needs -- writing instructional objectives, or time management, for example. Luckily, at present there are two separate groups working on packaged programs on typical staff development topics. One of these is the multi-million dollar project funded by the Exxon Corporation known as the Higher Education Management Institute; the second is the Kellogg funded project of the University of Texas. Both should produce excellent materials which could be used as is, or adapted for use on community college campuses all over the country.

We make staff development one of the criteria used in appraising performance - The success of the community college is due to its ability to change to meet the needs of a changing clientele. In the past, much of this change was accomplished through addition of staff with the knowledge, skills or attitudes needed to accomplish the changes. Now we are faced with the same, if not greater, need to change, but must do it with existing staff - which means developing them. As participation in staff development becomes a necessity for survival of the college, it can no longer be considered a voluntary activity. As a corallary to this, colleges will need to award credit toward promotion, tenure and retention for participation in staff development activities.

We consider staff development part of the "cost of doing business" - As the dependency on staff development increases, so will the realization that it is too important a function to be left until last in budget allocation. I anticipate that colleges will need to budget 2-5 percent of their operating budgets to adequately provide for staff development. Staff development can no longer be contingent upon outside money.

Staff development is considered a means not an end. There is already evidence of some staff development people becoming so wrapped up on the activity of running their staff development program that they lose sight of a fundamental fact of organizational life. Staff development is a means to an end, the end being the improved effectiveness and efficiency in which community colleges accomplish their

purposes. The responsibility for the latter is a line manager's responsibility. An effective staff development program facilitates the accomplishment of organizational goals. When line managers cease to have control over staff development or when staff development people begin to act like line managers -- without assuming the responsibility of line managers, then staff development ceases to have a useful function.

Staff development includes personal development as well as professional development - Staff development exists to improve performance. To improve the performance of an individual, you need to focus on the whole individual, not just that part which relates to the job. In recognition of this, business and industry have been offering programs of a personal development nature for some time. Recently, a few colleges have begun to offer what could be considered personal development programs as part of their staff development programs. Typical topics included are:

--parenting
--money management
--preparation for retirement
--spouse relations
--diet/weight control
--physical fitness

Staff development programs are directed at all the staff not just the faculty - Historically, faculty have been the target of most development activities. There is abundant evidence to support the need for staff development by counselors, managers, board members, and non-instructional staff. Singling out one segment not only creates morale problems but often results in situations where faculty efforts at incorporating newly learned skills are thwarted by well-meaning, but poorly informed administrators.

Colleges can learn when and how to use outside consultants - As an individual with considerable experience as a consultant, I am concerned at the money and time wasted because colleges are unable to use consultant help effectively. Perhaps the best possible example of this are the Title III institutions which either allow an assisting agency to send a parade of dis-jointed, ill-informed speakers to a campus or who make the same mistakes themselves. Good outside assistance is critically important to the success of many projects and institutions must learn when and how to use a consultant.

The various state organizations for staff development and NCSPOD are effective in their mission(s). As mentioned previously, several states have state organizations for staff development and we now have a new national organization. In my opinion, both are needed. Staff development people need an organization, especially at this time. Staff development is new, and the people working in it, whether as coordinators or committee members need ideas and reinforcement. Peer groups at the state and national level which provide these are critically important.

Those persons given the responsibility for staff development are selected with care. The coordinator of staff development (or chairman of the staff development committee) is obviously a very key person in the success of the program. I am disppointed to find that there are already signs that the position is filled with persons whose very selection reduced the chances for success of the program.

Earlier, I attempted to set forth criteria for selecting a person who would be responsible for staff development. The list is still valid and I repeat it here:

Must have:

- A master's degree (the "union card")
- Teaching experience (for credibility with the faculty)
- Good organizational ability
- Confidence and respect of staff and administration
- Realistic expectations about what can and what cannot be done, given resources and time
- A non-threatening personality
- Training in strategies for effective adult learning
- Training in staff development

Should have:

- Training or expertise in human relations, group process
- Knowledge of staff development people/programs elsewhere

Could have:

- Training or expertise in instructional design, organizational development and strategies for implementing change

While each item of the foregoing list is an important ingredient in the future success of the staff development movement, the two which follow are the two elements which I would most like to discuss.

<u>The program is adequately evaluated</u>. At present, we seem to be equating activity with results in our evaluation of staff development. We're much more likely to quote statistics about the number of workshops or participants, than the results attributable to them. However, the "bloom" of staff development is fast wearing off. I feel that staff development programs will soon have to

justify their continued existence on the basis of hard data related to effectiveness. In evaluating staff development, I like to use the four levels concept of Don Kirkpatrick. According to this, the first level of evaluation is similar to "knee jerk" in nature, that is, it consists primarily of reactions of the participants at the end of an activity. It often has more to do with timing of the activity or how they reacted to the workshop leader than anything else. Rarely do you find evaluation at level two, which deals with the extent to which learning occurred. Naturally, to do an adequate job of measuring or determining this, it is necessary to do some sort of pre and post testing. The more sophisticated level three evaluation is virtually unheard of. It consists of an attempt to determine if there have been any changes in behavior which can be attributed to the staff development activity. Needless to say, a finding that learning has occurred does not necessarily mean that this will be followed by a change in behavior. The fourth, and highest level of evaluation has to do with the results obtained as a consequence of the behavioral change. It is entirely possible that: 1) there may have been a positive reaction to the workshop; 2) learning may have occurred; and 3) there may have been a change in behavior and there be little or no demonstrable change in the results accomplished.

The organization as well as the staff is developed. On the last two occasions I have been asked to speak about staff development, I have agreed to only if I can also talk about organizational development. The titles of two of these presentations are representative; "Staff and Organizational Development: Key to Survival" at last summer's International Institute on the Community College and "Staff Development Is Not Enough" at last summer's NCSPOD annual meeting. Both presentations conveyed the message that I close with today. If we think that further development of the staff is all we need do to meet the challenges of the future, we are destined for failure. Among its other shortcomings sole emphasis on staff development neglects the need to adapt the organization so that it can respond to pressures exerted by staff with newly acquired knowledge and skills. Staff development also is not sufficient in dealing with the problems that I find in many institutions today. Problems such as:

- policies/procedures which are incompatible with what the organization is doing or should be doing
- inappropriate organizational structures for present or future functions
- disruptive competition and lack of team work

In conclusion, let me close with an analogy in which we think of staff development as a tree. At present the staff development tree is growing and maturing. Its historical roots, while relatively young, are implanted in a receptive soil, and are well fertilized by a mixture of need and resources. Its 1200 limbs each representing

a community college show very uneven growth. On most limbs a faculty development branch has begun to grow, while on a few others, there are encouraging signs of growth on the president and trustee branches. However, there is only very slight evidence of growth on the chairperson or dean branches and virtually no growth on the chairperson or dean branches and virtually no growth on the non-instructional branches. Scattered over the tree are a few blossoms representing potential fruit and the bees are busy collecting the pollen from each and transporting it about. However, on the horizon some dark clouds are approaching representing tough times ahead. At this point there is some question as to whether the tree is sufficiently developed to weather the storm. Its chances for survival would be much better had it been planted in an orchard of organizational development trees but alas, no such orchards were to be found.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024